

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

|  |   |                            |
|--|---|----------------------------|
| Dwayne Ishaaq,   | ) |                            |
|  | ) |                            |
| Plaintiff,   | ) | C.A. No. 6:14-2759-HMH-JDA |
|  | ) |                            |
| vs.  | ) | <b>OPINION &amp; ORDER</b> |
|  | ) |                            |
| Smith Moore Leatherwood, LLP;  | ) |                            |
| Cornerstone National Bank; Roger Anthony; )  |   |                            |
| and Susan Jolly, Jolly and Anthony in their )<br>personal and professional capacities, ) |   |                            |
|  | ) |                            |
| Defendant.   | ) |                            |

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.<sup>1</sup> Dwayne Ishaaq (“Ishaaq”), proceeding pro se, alleges a retaliation claim pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for violation of his civil rights. In her Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Austin recommends summarily dismissing the above-captioned case without prejudice and without service of process.

Ishaaq filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party’s right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir.

<sup>1</sup> The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Ishaaq's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Austin's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference.

It is therefore

**ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's complaint, docket number 1, is summarily dismissed without prejudice and without service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
October 16, 2014

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.